



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

24

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,843	02/15/2001	John T. Hurst	30788-00016	3829
24318 7590 02/05/2007 Mitchell, Silberberg & Knupp, LLP 11377 West Olympic Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90064			EXAMINER BLAIR, DOUGLAS B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/05/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/784,843

Applicant(s)

HURST ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas B. Blair

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,7-9,11,12,15,17-19,21,23 and 25-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,7-9,11,12,15,17-19,21,23 and 25-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn. The finality of the last office action was premature because claim 11 was not amended to add new subject matter but rather it added the subject matter of cancelled claim 16. Therefore the rejection of claim 11 based on new art was improper in a Final Rejection.

Specification

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the applicant is claiming digital feature-length-theater-quality motion pictures however this term is never defined by the applicant's specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 5-6, 9, 11-12, 15-16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the U.S. Patent Number 6,795,092 to Nagai et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0023970 by Panabaker.

Art Unit: 2142

5. As to claim 1, Nagai teaches a method for use in delivering programming content, said method comprising: (a) dividing programming content into smaller chunks of data, wherein said programming content comprises at least one of (i) a software program or (ii) content for playing on an electronic device (col. 5, lines 34-57, and Figure 4); (b) creating a chunk file for each chunk of data, said chunk file including said chunk of data (multimedia files in Figure 4); (c) generating a manifest file that includes information describing how at least one of execute or play the chunks of data (reproduction control information in Figure 4); and (d) transmitting the chunk files created in step (b) and the manifest file generated in step (c) to a remote location (col. 5, lines 24-33); however Nagai does not explicitly teach wherein at least one of the field transmitted in step (d) is transmitted electronically and at least one of the files transmitted in step (d) is transmitted on a physical storage medium.

Panabacker teaches a method in of distributing programming content which includes a manifest file, in which some files are transmitted electronically and some files are transmitted on a physical medium (paragraph 59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Nagai regarding a programming content delivery method with the teachings of Panabacker regarding specific delivery method for programming content because sending a manifest file electronically allows quicker updates of presentation data.

6. As to claim 5, Panabacker teaches a method wherein the chunk files are distributed across a set of physical storage media, and wherein each of said physical storage media in the set contains the manifest file (paragraph 27).

Art Unit: 2142

7. As to claim 9, Nagai teaches a method wherein the manifest file identifies each chunk of data in the programming content (the reproduction control information in Figure 4).

8. As to claims 25-26, Nagai teaches the transmission of multimedia files and Panabaker teaches the transmission of television. Official Notice is taken that motion pictures are considered to be part of the data that television comprises.

9. As to claims 11, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

10. As to claim 12, the SMIL specification teaches a method wherein the chunks of data are stored such that each chunk remains separately identifiable (multimedia files in Figure 4).

11. As to claims 15-16 and 19, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 5-6 and 9.

12. As to claims 27-33 are rejected for the same reasons as the preceding claims.

13. Claims 7-8, 17-18, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,795,092 to Nagai et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0023970 by Panabaker in further view of RFC 1321 by Rivest.

14. As to claims 7-8, 17-18, 21, and 23 the Nagai-Panabaker combination makes obvious the subject matter of claims 1, 10-11 and 20; however the Nagai-Panabaker combination does not explicitly teach the use of a message digest.

Rivest teaches the use of a message digest for verifying integrity of data (See executive summary).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Nagai-Panabaker combination regarding the use of chunk files for transmitting data with the teachings of Rivest regarding the use of a message digest because a message digest is a computer networking standard and thus a well

Art Unit: 2142

known method for verifying the integrity of data received. U.S. Patents 5,765,176, 5,745,574 and 5,692,047 are some examples of publications that illustrate the use of message digests.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 12/8/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant's arguments with regard to the Nagai patent do not address the specifically mapped limitations previously presented in the rejection. Since these mappings dispute the assertions that the applicant is arguing, the applicant is urged to consider the mappings in the rejection. The elements alleged as not to being taught by the applicant are clearly explained in the rejection. With regard to the Panabacker reference, it clearly shows that the transfer of data through an electronic medium such as email or through a physical medium such as a DVD, CD is arbitrary and thus obvious.

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B. Blair whose telephone number is (571) 272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Douglas Blair

DBB



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER